

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Office for its remarks and observations which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

2. OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

A variety of informalities in the Claims is alleged. Each of the alleged informalities has been corrected. Accordingly, the present objections are deemed overcome.

3. 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 38, 41-42, 45, 12-28, 30-31, 35, 49-65, 67-68 and 72 are rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,510,26 ("Crane") in view of U.S. patent application publication no. 2004/0139352 ("Shewchuck"). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Office relies on the combination of Crane, col. 4, lines 5-10 and Shewchuck, ¶ 0065 as teaching or suggesting:

"establishing said identified entities as trusted entities by issuing a trust token for each entity successfully authenticating to said network service, said trust token comprising a data object that includes a client identifier. . . ."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The teaching from Crane describes return of an authentication token by the application server 12 to the user. No details are given of the contents of the authentication token. The Office relies on the teaching from Shewchuck to supply the missing information. Shewchuck ¶ 0065 describes the encapsulation of security data 252 in a client security token. However, the token originates with the client and is passed, via message 242 to the requesting server message processor. ¶ 0065 of Shewchuck has nothing to do with issue of a trust token to a client by a server, and inclusion of a client identifier by the server in the token issued to the client by the server. Accordingly, the combination of Crane and Shewchuck fails to teach or suggest

all elements described in Claim 1. The present rejection is therefore improper. Claim 1 is therefore deemed allowable over the combination.

In view of their dependence from an allowable parent, the dependent Claims are deemed allowable in their own right without any separate consideration of their merits.

In spite of the foregoing, in the interest of advancing prosecution of the Application, Claim 1 is amended to include the subject matter of Claims 17 and 18, with 17 and 18 being cancelled from the Application.

The Office relies on Crane, col. 5, lines 44-55 as teaching or suggesting "storing said issued trust token on said client." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited teaching from Crane, describing a plurality of device authentication servers, says absolutely nothing about trust tokens, issue of trust tokens, or storage of a trust token issued by a server on a client. Shewchuck adds nothing to Crane in this regard. Because there is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of the subject matter of Claim 17, the present rejection of Claim 17 is improper. The subject matter of Claim 17 is therefore deemed allowable over the combination.

The Office relies on Shewchuck, ¶ 0089 as teaching or suggesting "transmitting said stored issued trust token along with said user ID, authentication credentials, and client identifier from said client to said network service." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Shewchuck, ¶ 0089 describes selection of client security output data but there is no teaching or suggestion in ¶ 0089 that the client security output data is incorporated into a trust token, that is then issued to the client, and which the client later transmits to a server in order to establish that it has previously been extended trust by the server. In fact, Figs. 3, 5 and 6 depict a number of scenarios under which a client message processor transmits security input data, and receives security output data. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in the entirety of Shewchuck that the client later submits a trust token, previously issued by a server, to the server, in order to establish trust. Crane adds nothing to Shewchuck. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion in the

combination of the subject matter of Claim 18. The present rejection is therefore improper. Claim 18 is thus deemed allowable over the combination.

Even if the present rejection were not improper, because Claim 1, as amended, incorporates the subject matter of Claims 17 and 18, shown to be allowable, it would be allowable over the combination, thereby overcoming the present rejection.

The foregoing remarks apply equally to Claim 38. Claim 38 is amended, in similar fashion to Claim 1, to incorporate the subject matter of Claims 54 and 55. Claim 38 is therefore deemed to be allowable for the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable.

In view of their dependence from an allowable parent claim, Claim 38's dependent claims are deemed to be allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

Claims 10, 29, 37, 47 66 and 74 are rejected as being unpatentable over Crane in view of Shewchuck and further in view of U.S. patent application publication no. 2003/0028495 ("Pallante"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper/overcome.

Claims 16, 19-20, 24, 53, 56-57 and 61 are rejected as being unpatentable over Crane in view of Shewchuck and further in view of U.S. patent application publication no. 2003/0177388 ("Pallante"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper/overcome.

Claims 34 and 71 are rejected as being unpatentable over Crane in view of Shewchuck and further in view of U.S. patent application publication no. 2002/0073339 ("Card"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper/overcome.

Claims 75-84, 89-91 and 93-94 are rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,944,794 ("Okamoto") in view of U.S. patent application publication no. 2002/0032793 ("Malan"). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Office relies on Okamoto, col. 13, line 55 to col. 14, line 3 as teaching or suggesting "for each successful authentication, adding or updating a database record containing at least a user identifier, an originating network address and a

date/timestamp of first and/or the current successful authentication. . . .” Applicant respectfully disagrees. While the session data described by Okamoto includes a valid period, there is no teaching or suggestion in Okamoto of updating a database record contain at least . . . a date/timestamp of first and/or the current successful authentication.”

The Office relies on Okamoto, col. 14, line 46-57 and col. 15, line 60 to col. 16, line 4 as teaching or suggesting “comparing all subsequent authentication requests to said record;

“where the user identifier of a subsequent request matches that of a successful authentication, extending trust to the subsequent request if it’s originating network address and timestamp information satisfy predetermined criteria in relation to said record. . . .” Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is no teaching or suggestion in the cited portions of Okamoto of using the user identifier to as a preliminary criterion for extending trust. As taught by Okamoto, if transmission source host address and destination address respectively match remote system address and home system address, authentication is successful.

The Office relies on Malan, ¶ 0069 as teaching or suggesting “processing remaining requests according to at least a second policy, wherein processing remaining requests according to at least a second policy comprises adding a configurable amount of incremental response latency when processing untrusted logins.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is no mention whatsoever in the cited teaching from Malan of adding response latency to untrusted logins. Malan is directed to detecting malicious hosts and applying filtering and rate-limiting to requests from malicious hosts.

The combination therefore fails to teach or suggest each of the elements of Claim 75. The present rejection is therefore improper. Accordingly, Claim 75 is deemed allowable over the combination. In view of their dependence from an allowable parent claim, Claim 75’s dependent claims are deemed allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

Claims 85-86 are rejected as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Malan and further in view of Botz. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 92 is rejected as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Malan and further in view of Card. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

4. For the record, Applicant respectfully traverses any and all factual assertions in the file that are not supported by documentary evidence. Such include assertions based on findings of inherency, assertions based on official notice, and any other assertions of what is well known or commonly known in the prior art.

5. No new matter is added by way of the above amendments. The foregoing amendments are made in the interest of advancing prosecution of the Application. They do not signify agreement with the Examiner's position. Nor do they reflect intent to sacrifice claim scope. Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue protection of a scope it reasonably believes it is entitled to in one or more continuing submissions to the USPTO.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the application was deemed to be in allowable condition and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw her rejections and issue Notice of Allowance such that the application may timely pass to Issuance as United States Letters Patent.

Should the Examiner find it helpful, she is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862